REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A version of all pending claims is found at pages 2-7. Favorable consideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I.   Rejection of Claim 1-27 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cohen *et al.* (US 6,324,543). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons. Cohen *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every limitation as recited in the claimed invention.

> A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes *each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)(emphasis added).

i.   *Claims 1, 14, 15, 23 and 27*

Independent claim 1 recites a system for interacting with an object that comprises *a method call interceptor operable to intercept a method call to an object and to route the method call to a proxy, the method call accessible to application code, and an application code generic proxy operable to receive an intercepted method call, the application code generic proxy further operable to invoke a method on the object, to receive results from the object and to pass results to the entity that generated the intercepted method call.* Independent claims 14, 15, 23 and 27 recite similar limitations. The claimed invention utilizes a method call interceptor to intercept method calls prior to receipt thereof by an object, and subsequently redirects the method call to an application code generic proxy; the method call interceptor interpositions itself between the method

- 8 -

09/893,829   MS174293.1

call and the application code generic proxy. Further, the method call interceptor is accessible to application code, meaning that the method call interceptor is not only capable of intercepting method calls, but is also capable of being accessible to application programmers to populate the method call with information concerning the intercepted method call and then transferring the method call to an application code generic proxy. The invention as claimed relates to an application code generic proxy operable to receive an intercepted method call from the method call interceptor. The application code generic proxy is also capable of invoking a method on the object, and to pass and receive results to and from the entity that created the intercepted method call. Cohen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest any of these exemplary features.

Cohen *et al.* teaches a system and method that allows programs to become dynamically reconfigurable without programmer intervention. According to Cohen *et al.*, this means that programs can be dynamically distributed among multiple computers within a computer network without modification to the source code of the programs running on the system. *See*, Abstract. In particular, Cohen *et al.* teaches a dynamic object distribution that generates local and remote "proxies" which intercept method calls to and from the object and routes the calls to the object; it is the generated proxy that intercepts the method call, not a method call interceptor. Moreover, the generated proxy in Cohen *et al.* is incapable of embedding application code within the intercepted method call so as to facilitate execution of the embedded application code by either the proxy or the remote object. Thus, Cohen *et al.* is clearly distinguishable from the claimed invention wherein a method call interceptor is utilized to intercept a method call, and if necessary embedd application code capable of execution on the proxy or the remote object, within the method call prior to sending the method call to an application code generic proxy.

Cohen *et al.* does not teach or suggest the application code generic proxy as recited in the subject claims. Rather Cohen *et al.* teaches a proxy that is generated by a proxy generator; one that generates a local and remote proxy - proxies that are identities of each other. Further, Cohen *et al.* neither teaches nor suggests an application code generic proxy operable to receive an intercepted method call. Rather, Cohen *et al.* simply teaches a method whereby the proxy generator creates two identical instances of the

- 9 -

object, *e.g.* a local and remote proxy. Nowhere in Cohen *et al.* is it taught or suggested that an application code generic proxy is capable of receiving an intercepted method call as in applicants' claimed invention. Moreover, Cohen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest a system wherein the application code generic proxy is capable of *invoking a method on an object*. Cohen *et al.* merely teaches a proxy-to-proxy invocation method wherein code in the remote proxy ensures that when a method is called, a remote method invocation call to the local proxy is executed. It is apparent therefore that Cohen *et al.* does not teach or suggest an application code generic proxy capable of receiving intercepted method calls, and thereupon invoking the intercepted method call ensconced within the application code generic proxy on the object. Accordingly, in view of at least the foregoing, it is submitted that the rejection with regard to independent claims 1, 14, 15, 23 and 27, and claims that depend there from, should with withdrawn.

ii.   *Claim 24*

Applicants' claimed invention recites a data packet adapted to be transmitted between two or more computer processes, the data packet comprising one or more *identifier/value pairs*, the identifier identifying the value associated with the identifier/value pair, and the value providing information associated with an intercepted method call on an object. Cohen *et al.* is silent regarding utilization of identifier/value pairs to associate an identifier with a value, wherein the value is associated with an intercepted method call on an object. Accordingly, it is submitted that Cohen *et al.* does not teach or suggest this aspect of the invention as claimed; and this rejection of independent claim 24 and those claims that depend there from should be withdrawn.

- 10 -

09/893,829   MS174293.1

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP

Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731

- 11 -